DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 075 758 CG 008 022

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Bingham, William C., Ed. |
| TITLE | Accountability: Process and Product. |
| INSTITUTION | Princeton Univ., N.J.; Rutgers, The State Univ., New Brunswick, N.J. |
| PUB DATE | 20 Oct 71 |
| NOTE | 38p.; Proceedings of the Rutgers Guidance Conference (28th, October 20, 1971) |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29 |
| DESCRIPTORS | *Career Education; Career Planning; Change Agents; Counselors; Developmental Guidance; *Educational Accountability; Educational Responsibility; Government Role; Group Guidance; Guidance Objectives; *Guidance Personnel; *Guidance Programs; Guidance Services; Instruction; Measurement; *Program Evaluation; Resource Staff Role; School Systems; Vocational Development |

ABSTRACT

Three speakers from the Rutgers Guidance Conference explore facets of the concept of accountability, including why it enjoys its present popularity, how it has developed, how it applies to guidance programs, and how it is measured. Accountability has a variety of functions in a school system. The speakers cite its possible use as a means for school systems to gain lost confidence and support, as a basis to new program designs (such as a career development program which changes a counselor's responsibilities from a major emphasis on direct services to students to the role of resource agent to other staff members), or as a means to evaluate school guidance programs. What to measure and how to evaluate constitute difficulties in applying the concept of accountability to guidance situations. (Author/LAA)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 075758

Proceedings

28th Rutgers Guidance Conference
October 20, 1971

# ACCOUNTABILITY:

# PROCESS AND PRODUCT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

William C. Bingham
Editor

CG 008 022

# INTRODUCTION

In a year of rigorous re-examination of school budgets, it proved a good choice to devote this 28th Rutgers Guidance Conference to Accountability. To be sure, the term has become a catchword, and that process often foreshadows dissipation of the concept. In this case, it is predictable that continuing pressure to define accountability in education will continue. The thrust in that direction may well be stronger for counselors than for other educators. If so, then counselors should be in the forefront. This Conference served to answer few questions; some old questions were refined, perhaps some new ones were raised. At most, it represents a step in an important direction. Hopefully, it has, for some, helped to define some "next steps."

-- Editor

The Planning Committee

F. Donald Kelly, Co-chairman
H. Robert Nelson, Co-chairman
James Alexander
Kenneth M. Benus
William C. Bingham
Richard Evans
Sandra O. Gold
Sandra Grundfest
May Hart
Elaine W. House
William Humphries
Rev. Walter Reilly
Phyllis Rogers
Gertrude Schifter
C. Winfield Scott
Martin Stamm
Charles Tabler
Robert H. Whiteley

Three days before the scheduled date of the 28th Rutgers Guidance Conference, James E. Allen, Jr., the keynote speaker, was killed in an airplane crash. This volume is dedicated to his memory. Through a rare combination of human attributes--political courage and personal integrity--he was an inspiration to many.

-- Editor

A particular word of thanks goes to Dr. Edward J. Meade, Jr. of the Ford Foundation. On unreasonably short notice he agreed to read Dr. Allen's paper. In the following pages, Dr. Allen's paper is presented in full, with Dr. Mead's comments in parentheses.

# ACCOUNTABILITY -- WHOSE RESPONSIBILITY?

James E. Allen, Jr.

Visiting Lecturer in Education and Public Affairs
Princeton University

ACCOUNTABILITY -- WHOSE RESPONSIBILITY?

James E. Allen, Jr.

This is an opportunity for me, but with all due respect to the Association and University, it's less of an opportunity than it is a chance for me to repay a debt that I can never repay. Jim Allen and I were associates for some 12 years, but I guess I got to know him best when I had a fortuitous episode in my life in 1969. For some reason, I as a practicing democrat was called to Washington by a practicing republican by the name of Robert Finch. "Come down and give me two days so we can talk about issues in Education," said Robert Finch. In the course of those two days (which by the way took two weeks) the present administration saw fit to appoint what in my mind was one of the best, if not the best, person in education, who understands the sensitive role between state and federal governments in education, James Allen. Jim was talked into the job. He earlier turned it down when offered the job by President Kennedy, as some of you may know. He had a condition, that is, he couldn't come until May. So I hung around from January 69 to May or June of 69 until Jim Allen got on board. It's ironic because I find myself sitting in for my now present boss, who was commissioner of education under Lyndon Johnson, waiting for Jim Allen. I guess I'll always wait for Jim Allen. He was a remarkable individual. Dean Schwebel, I think, caught the spirit of Jim Allen, his toughness and firmness with respect to moral issues in our business, in segregation, in Cambodia. He was accountable; you can see that in his record throughout his career. He did indeed put his job on the line. It was a death wish in some ways. We all knew what would happen as he spoke out as he did. But he at least wanted to be able to face himself and his constituents with a clear conscience, and he did. So I come to you with mixed feelings frankly, on other transification, I'd say "gee its a great opportunity for me to talk to people from my home state", but I come more in payment of a debt that will never be repayed. I guess. I'm going to speak or read rather Jim's text, which he prepared earlier. No apologies for the text, it's what Jim wanted to say, but plenty of apologies for how it will be said this morning. Jim titles his remarks.

"Accountability--Whose Responsibility?"

Welcome to another stop on the accountability bandwagon!

What I want to know is are we here just as barkers at the latest medicine show or are we here as real physicians, seeking a new cure?

Are we just making big talk to sell the same old elixir that will soothe and comfort but won't really help or change, or are we seriously brewing a new wonder drug?

Certainly, the ills and problems of education today require something more than a mere soothing syrup, and the real question is: Are we just trying to make the schools look good or really be good? (I'll pause here because Jim's words just haunt me.)

The answer to this question lies, it seems to me in another question: Why accountability now? (Why are we here in 1971, worrying about accountability? I heard earlier today that this has been planned for this conference for something like two years.)

As a matter of logic, accountability should always have been a major factor in education--and of course, it has not been ignored--but too often it has been hit or miss in operation and woefully unscientific in design and application. (Now, we all have gone through the courses, have we not, where we say we do it on behalf of the children, and we design our programs and needs and so forth, but by and large its been rhetoric rather than action).

Is its present popularity a response to outside criticism and lagging support, or is it a response to an inner sense of failure? If it is just the former, (that we are now reacting to something we got from the outside,) we are wasting our time and might as well go home and forget the whole thing, for such a basis for accountability can all too easily distort its purpose and limit its usefulness.

Certainly our school systems want to win back lost confidence and gain more support, and accountability is the best and surest way to do this. But such a result will be attained only if accountability has as its aim genuine improvement and the elimination of deficiencies that can stand as justification of confidence and increased support.

Unfortunately, in the minds of too many, accountability has much too much of a public relations orientation, and this could be fatal--destroying the potential of one of the most hopeful developments in education, and making it just another one of those cyclical fads that seem to sweep through the educational world causing great commotion but leaving things little changed after their passing.

Accountability is more often than not considered in the narrow sense of assessment and measurement rather than in its broader and more definitive meaning of being responsible and liable. Thus defined, the question becomes: responsible to whom?

If we accept the premise that the schools belong to the people (and certainly Jim Allen believed that)--the premise upon which our public school system has been developed--(and that is the premise) then the answer is obviously (we are accountable to) the public. But what is the public?

Is it society as a whole? It has generally been accepted that the education system serves society by producing valuable

members, and this service encompasses everything from training people to be good citizens, to teaching them useful skills, to making it possible for each individual to reach self-fulfillment.

Is it the taxpayers? (Not in the limited sense of the taxpayers association that all of us have met from time to time.) Here the responsibility seems very clear. The taxpayer supports the schools and deserves the assurance that his investment is worthwhile. The concern here generally is that the schools be run efficiently and that the tax bill be not too great.

Is it the parents? They look to the schools to educate their children, and by this they usually mean that they expect their children to be able to participate effectively in society and to be prepared to make a living. (I guess I would have to say, aside from Jim's remarks, too many parents think it's a place to keep the kids quiet.)

Is it the students? This is the most direct and the most difficult responsibility, for the school must deal with the dual task of considering and satisfying the needs and interests of both the present student and the future adult.

Obviously, the concept of accountability as responsibility is a very complex one, and the schools cannot be considered as accountable in any simple sense to any one group. (Thus making the issue or problem much more difficult.) But whatever part of the whole may be in mind, the essence of concern is not with methods and means of accountability but rather with the matter of responsiveness. Certainly, then, crucial in the objectives of accountability is an increased responsiveness of the educational system to those whom it is supposed to serve.

Who then influences the system? To what pressures do the schools respond?

Students, parents, and taxpayers have the influence of consumer and provider. As consumers, there is little opportunity beyond individual and organized protest and persuasion to influence policy. As providers, the most effective action is the negative one of withholding funds, (the New Jersey track record on annual budget and bond issues is not a very impressive one, but simply a documentation of Jim's point) with too little opportunity to distinguish between reasons of tax burden and dissatisfaction with school performance. (You never really know when they vote you down if it is because they think they are paying too much or are getting too little.)

The education profession as a whole is, of course, enormously influential. Teachers' organization contracts contain provisions about many things beyond salary and working conditions. (In one of my other lives, chairman of the board of trustees of Jersey City State College, we have a single contract with the professors, a state contract. At the state level we deal only with economic

issues but at the local college we deal with all the other issues. It turned out that all the other issues are economic issues as well. Its hard to separate these two, but the point that Jim is making here is that teacher organizations in their contracts and in the negotiations have a great deal of say well beyond that of influencing salary or working conditions of the teacher.) The profession itself for the most part governs the accrediting agencies. Education lobbies exert great influence on state and federal legislation. (Everybody knows how well vocational education lobbies work, for example.) Schools of education prepare the teachers and administrators who run the schools; they prepare also many of those in state and federal education agencies. Organizations such as the AFT, NEA and AASA, APGA have nationwide constituencies and wield tremendous political power.

Local boards of education have the responsibility for the immediate operation of the schools, and their policy decisions, though shaped within the limits of state and federal laws and policies and relationships to the profession, in large measure, determine the nature of local educational opportunity. (The point here is that the local board has a great deal to say about how you will serve the schools and in what ways you might be held accountable.)

The state has the legal responsibility and authority for the provision of education, (as outlined in the Constitution) and its fiscal, regulatory and supervisory functions profoundly affect the quality of local performance.

The Federal government (even though it has only 5 or 6% of the overall investment in education) because of the nature and scope of present conditions and trends in education is assuming a much more direct and influential role. (You know, if we were talking 10 or 12 years ago we would barely know the U. S. Office of Education exists, but now we find ourselves supported by Title III or Title VII or what ever it may be.)

Among all these interests bearing upon the schools, seeking to influence their performance, where is the push that gets action? Where is the force that can make accountability a working reality?

In my judgment, it is in government and the profession.

Even with better means of exerting their influence and wielding their power, the public has only a limited role. This is not to underestimate the importance of the public's role. Indeed, the public has to become more aggressive and unrelenting in its insistence upon performance as a measure of quality. (The argument is not on performance so much but on how we measure that performance.)

A promising note for the future of stronger and more active public concern for education is the increasing interest of youth in working for change within the system and in gaining greater support. It was highly encouraging to me to have a student at Princeton consult me last Spring on the feasibility of organizing a national youth movement in support of education. What better group to reinforce the drive for accountability! I strongly encourage such a movement and urge all concerned youth to take part. (Jim Allen was a good friend of kids.) Not only can the young bring the insights of immediate experience but they can also serve as a constant reminder that it is the product and not the process that must be our constant concern. (The product in this case means the kids.)

But even with the maximum exercise of their power, the public can only deserve and demand action (they can't provide)--government and the profession have to provide it, and the real push must come from these sources.

It cannot be just gently pushing or polite nudging. For too long a kind of protective pussy-footing, both in government and the profession, has characterized efforts to bring about real change in education. In seeking to avoid stepping on sensitive toes, we have too often succeeded in protecting the profession at the expense of the children and youth--a true silent majority if there ever was one, just now beginning to raise its voice and assert its claims.

In a broad sense, the educational responsibilities of government at the state and federal levels and those of the profession divide, with much interacting and overlapping, into that of the responsibility of government for creating those conditions in which good education can flourish and that of the profession for producing good education within those conditions.

The ability of state and federal governments to create conditions favorable for good education will be greatly strengthened by three actions which would be immediately gotten underway. The first is a complete overhaul of the patterns of school finance involving at the federal level a combination of consolidated categorical aids and of broadly based general aid, allocated on an equalization basis, and, at the state level, assumption by the state of all, or substantially all, of the local costs of elementary and secondary education. A recent California Supreme Court decision has re-emphasized the imperative need for the states to drastically overhaul their school finance patterns in the direction of full state assumption of school costs. (The way we presently finance education does not provide equal opportunity for all, and this fact is going to have a profound effect, whether we are worried about how to place kids in college next year or how we are going to get them readmitted to class. There is going to be a significant change, and I think Jim signals it).

The second deals with structure. At the federal level, education should be elevated to Department status with a Cabinet-

level Secretary and national advisory committee.

Department rank would ensure the sharper focus of greater visibility and high status, and an advisory council would provide the opportunity for advocacy of education's concerns, unhampered by undue influence of partisan politics or special interests.

The council should (as Jim Allen would see it) be bipartisan with its members appointed by the President for staggered terms of sufficient length to prevent excessive dominance by any one President or political party. Its basic role should be advisory, not administrative. As an established body, not tied to the four-year election cycle, it could provide a continuity that could help to mitigate the disruptions of changes in Administration. It could enlighten the nation by making an annual report to the President and the Congress on the state of education. (A good point here is that the U. S. Office of Education was established by the Congress to report to the Congress annually on the state of the American Education. The Office of Education is over 100 years old, and it has never reported on the state or condition of American education to anybody.) It could act as a conscience for the people of the country by both reflecting and arousing concern for the well-being of education.

At the state level, a strengthening of structure is even more essential, especially in the light of the trend toward proposals for full state funding. As the states are not organized and managed they are, in varying degrees, unprepared to encompass the expanded dimensions of their educational task or to deal with the broadened concepts that now define their role. Thus, each state must examine its own capabilities and undertake, to whatever degree may be necessary, an overhaul of its arrangements for the governance of education. Expanded federal support for education should incorporate incentives for modernization of state education structures. (Perhaps the state education departments will not look like reflections of a local school board or a local administrative unit of education).

The third action required to aid government in its responsibility for creating the conditions for good education is a systematic program of research and development. This aid would be substantially furthered by Congressional enactment of the legislation establishing a National Institute of Education, proposed last year by the President. (Which now has found its way through some parts of the Congress, and as of about a week ago, the outlook is positive. We may for the first time have something in Education which might be considered akin to the National Institutes of Health. Federal investment and fundamental research in matters of learning, in matters of instruction, done in a positive way and supported with sufficient resources, would aid all of us in seeking to do our jobs better.)

Obviously an adequate discussion of these actions would be a speech in itself (and Jim has speeches I'm sure), but I cite

them because they are essential to full effectiveness of the governmental role in accountability.

Despite the widespread interest in accountability, I (Jim Allen) doubt that it will advance on any large scale to the action stage without the determined leadership and constructive, focalized help of state and federal governments in both ways and means. (In some ways, he has let you off the hook. He said, "Now we will leave it up to the Federal and State legislation," but watch out, it will come back at you later.)

Government must assist in developing and making available the techniques and instruments of accountability. Government financing of education must recognize the need for accountability and use the power of the purse as leverage to encourage--indeed, where necessary, to require--accountability. (And there are schemes afoot that would reward school systems when productivity has been demonstrated.)

Within the profession there is growing support for accountability, but as is too often the case, it comes primarily from those who are already productive with support lacking where accountability is most needed. (You know, there are a lot of people who say they want to be held accountable as classroom teachers or the school principal or school superintendent, or the dean of education, but they are generally the people in our ranks who are already producing.)

The resistance to accountability is understandable. In the minds of many, it sets up an image of excessive testing and measurement, inimical to initiative and imagination. It implies criticism, generates defensiveness, and leads to a kind of pass-the-buck attitude. (Once I made a speech to secondary school principals and said accountability is a school issue. I took teachers off the hook by saying it's difficult to hold a seventh-grade geography teacher accountable for all those kids who pass through that door each day. I said the accountability unit in education is the school and not the teacher. So I made it possible to pass the buck from teachers to somebody else.)

An acceptance of accountability requires a perspective that recognizes the indivisibility of education and concentrates on its purpose.

This kind of perspective has become increasingly difficult to achieve as the numbers to be dealt with, and the expanding dimensions and character of education, have produced an undue concentration upon the parts rather than the whole.

Despite the vast machinery of the system, however, education's purpose is still simple--the development of the intellect and the discovery and encouragement of abilities and talents. In attempting to achieve this purpose on such a large scale, each of the various parts of the enterprise has itself become so immense as to demand a degree of attention that excludes, or makes

very difficult, a constant mindfulness of its place within the whole. (Since most of you are counselors, you might well ask yourselves, "Where does guidance fit in this whole accountability scheme?" Is it just to hold a counselor accountable for what happens to the child who leaves school? Perhaps not, but the question remains, what piece of the accountability fabric are guidance and counseling services responsible for?)

In relation to this point, I read with much interest the New York Times report of a speech by Buckminster Fuller, delivered at a meeting of the American Association of Museums, in which he said "We have so many specialized abilities we can blow ourselves to pieces, but we have no ability to coordinate ourselves. I see our society as very powerfully conditioned by its reflexes, with very, very tight ways of functioning. And that is dangerous--so dangerous that if man does not stop thinking locally and make the grade as a world man we may not be able to continue on this planet." The news report continued--"Citing the need for 'synergism,' thinking in terms of the whole rather than its parts, Mr. Fuller urged the development of a larger concept of man who could think in such terms."

More synergistic thinking within the profession can be a strong aid to a widespread acceptance of the necessity of accountability. (It's not how we hold the teacher accountable, the counselor accountable, the principal, or even how we hold the pupil accountable; it is rather that we all see that we are in concert, one with each other, accountable for something.)

By this time, if there was ever any doubt in your minds, it must be obvious that I (that is, Jim Allen) believe the accountability bandwagon is on the move because accountability is the most promising cure for many of education's serious ills.

The public to whom accountability is due is becoming more and more aware of this possible remedy, (performance contracts, voucher systems, national assessments) and is also much more sophisticated and able to detect any attempts to substitute more of the same old brew in new bottles. (What Jim Allen is saying is we can't get by by saying, "We have lovely schools, come and see us once a year.")

The responsibility for prescribing this remedy and for getting it into action rests primarily with government and the profession--and if we fail now to follow through, to make accountability a reality, the resulting loss of confidence (on part of the public) and withholding of support will make the present doubts about the effectiveness of our schools look like a veritable avalanche of approbation.

# ACCOUNTABILITY: IMPLICATIONS FOR GUIDANCE AND CAREER DEVELOPMENT . . .

John G. Odgers

Research and Development Specialist
The Center for Vocational and Technical Education
Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio

# ACCOUNTABILITY: IMPLICATIONS FOR GUIDANCE AND CAREER DEVELOPMENT

John G. Odgers

Probably there is no better way to start a paper on accountability than to admit that actual facts do not always correlate positively with appearances. I'm reminded of the do-it-yourself addict who heaved a sigh of relief and reached in his shirt pocket for a cigarette as he sat in the corner on the new carpeting, having just pounded the last tack. Not finding the pack, he glanced across the room and, sure enough, there in the middle of the carpet was a small lump. Disgusted, he went to the closet, got out a ball bat and flattened the bump so that no one would know. Completing this task, he walked into the dining room only to see his open cigarette pack lying on the table. Almost at the same instant from the family room came his wife's voice: "George, have you seen the parakeet?" No--things are not always what they appear to be. Sometimes they're worse--sometimes better. But it's important to know how close you are coming to meeting your objectives and at what cost. Cost in terms of money, cost in terms of time and energy.

As a starter, I would like to point out that the concept of accountability isn't as onerous to people in education as many outsiders think. Although many educators are thinking in terms of evaluation rather than the broader concept of accountability (which studies effectiveness in combination with efficiency), more and more educators are designing program change to build in accountability--both incrementally and summatively. And this involves advance planning. I want to come back to that later.

As never before in education, there seems to be a climate for change;--a national discontent both within and outside the schools; dissatisfaction with the state of traditional educational programs and the effectiveness of their impact on children. Committed teachers, administrators, and boards of education recognize that they can't survive without maintaining ongoing accountability. Many districts are seeking adequate leadership so they can become more effectively accountable. Not only are teachers, administrators, and boards of education showing more concern; parents, and other taxpayers want to know what will be achieved with their dollars in terms of relevant program outcomes. Dr. Allen emphasized this point throughout his speech.

In preparing for today's conference, I was asked to consider the concept of accountability from the point of view of the administrator. Having been a guidance administrator for the last quarter century, and this being a guidance conference, I am naturally assuming that I can react with the school guidance program uppermost in my mind. I would like first, however, to make a brief and undocumented review of the development of the concept of accountability--and then, expand on a point or two emphasized by Dr. Allen.

Historically, systems theory had its origins in philosophy, and remained quietly for generations as a tool of philosophers and logicians. Gradually systems applications were taken over by science. More recently, McNamara put systems into national defense. During the last fifteen to twenty years business and industry have put systems theory to work effectively in production, finance and management. Just now are we ready to put systems into education--recognizing that this must be done without dehumanizing the process. To accomplish this requires new competencies. To accomplish it requires thorough knowledge both of the culture and of human development--and the ability to maintain balance between these. A good systems approach to education (educational administration) must foster the development of knowledge, feeling and skill in balance--to motivate and to provide the background for mature adult self-social fulfillment. Uncommitted knowledge is most wasteful. Committed incompetence is dangerous. Education needs a rational design and people who believe in it and will work to make it work.

In the paper he prepared to present to you today, Dr. Allen used the following quotation from a New York Times report on a June 1971 speech by Buckminster Fuller: "We have so many specialized abilities we can blow ourselves to pieces, but we have no ability to coordinate ourselves." In a January 1971 presentation to the Convention of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, U. S. Commissioner of Education, Sidney P. Marland expressed this same concern, as it relates to education, in this way: ". . . education's most serious failing is its self-induced, voluntary fragmentation, the strong tendency of education's several parts to separate from one another, to divide the entire enterprise against itself." He went on to state that "the most grievous example of these intramural class distinctions is . . . the false dichotomy between things academic and things vocational" and to suggest that, "as a first step . . . we dispose of the term vocational education, and adopt the term career education."

These last comments by Dr. Marland have direct significance for your school guidance programs. Before examining their implications in relationship to accountability in guidance program administration, however, I would like to bring you the opinion of one additional authority on accountability.

In an article in the December 1970 Phi Delta Kappan (a special issue on Accountability), Dr. Henry S. Dyer, Vice President of Educational Testing Services, described accountability, as it applies to an individual school, in the following manner:

> "1. The professional staff of a school is to be held collectively responsible for knowing as much as it can (a) about the intellectual and personal-social development of the pupils in its charge and (b) about

the conditions and educational services that may be facilitating or impeding the pupils' development.

"2. The professional staff of a school is to be held collectively responsible for using this knowledge as best it can to maximize the development of its pupils toward certain clearly defined and agreed-upon pupil performance objectives.

"3. The board of education has a corresponding responsibility to provide the means and technical assistance whereby the staff of each school can acquire, interpret, and use the information necessary for carrying out the two foregoing functions.

"I emphasize the notion of joint accountability of the entire school staff in the aggregrate--the principal, teachers, specialists--because it seems obvious that what happens to any child in a school is determined by the multitude of transactions he has with many different people on the staff who perform differing roles and presumably have differing impacts on his learning, which cannot readily, if ever, be disentangled."

Dr. Allen emphasized in his paper the importance of the product, the youngster, the people we turn out of our schools. But, I think you will notice immediately after emphasizing product he identified need process changes to make a better product. I think we need to keep this in mind if we are focused in on product, but we have to pay definite and earnest attention to process to improve product.

I would like to use my last few minutes to relate my prior remarks to guidance program administration by quoting to you a brief statement which I made recently to the representatives from six school systems in six states which have been carefully selected to help commissioner Marland's dream of career education come true. As many of you know, the U. S. Office of Education has entered into contract with The Center for Vocational and Technical Education at the Ohio State University "to develop, test and install a career education system with the potential to revitalize the total educational program of a public school system by structuring student experiences around career development objectives. [1]The Hackensack, New Jersey system is one of the local educational agencies participating with us in this important project.

If we are to develop an educational system which will achieve this objective, changes will have to be made in the

---

[1]CVTE, A Comprehensive Career Education Model, 1971, p. 5.

typical school's guidance program to make it an integrated and basic component of the total education structure with a staff and a board of education which meet the criteria outlined by Dr. Dyer. Here is my message and charge to the six CCEM schools:

> "Ask any school counselor the major objective of his guidance program and he'll probably give you an answer something like this: 'To help every boy and girl develop into a mature, responsible, self-directing adult.' Ask him to be more specific and he'll probably come up with a series of developmental objectives which, with a little editing, sound something like this:
>
> "To help each boy and girl
> . to grow in self-insight and self-understanding
> . to grow in knowledge and appreciation of his environment: its opportunities, its limitations, its demands
> . to develop decision-making skills
> . to establish personal values and standards against which to weigh alternatives when decisions must be made
> . to acquire the interest and motivation prerequisite to action
> . to make plans and take action on them
> . to assess his successes and failures and to modify his plans accordingly.'
>
> So much for the counselor's stated objectives!
>
> Now ask him to summarize a case and he will most likely describe a boy or girl in need of help to meet a crisis situation or solve a pressing problem. Analyze the walk-in traffic coming to his office, or the pupils referred by teachers and the odds are you'll find kids with problems. They aren't there for development, they're there for help.
>
> Something must be wrong with our system if our guidance program gives lip service to objectives stressing a developmental approach but counselors find themselves spending most or all of their time tackling crises. The frustrating truth is that if we don't plan developmental guidance programs, to help students develop in such a way that crises are less frequent and less severe, we may be working for a losing cause. (Our program must be systems oriented and accountable.)
>
> In order to set the stage for a more balanced and effective guidance program, let's admit that most <u>counseling</u> is crisis-oriented. But let's also face

the fact that most kids don't need frequent counseling. What they do need is regular help in the normal process of career development; which is not typically provided on a one-to-one basis. In fact, career guidance is usually more efficient and effective if provided in a group setting, often in the form of instruction.

These comments in no way deny the importance of the counseling process, either as it relates to crises in the lives of students or to the need of many students for confirmation of personal plans, or for clues to alternatives. They do, however, give strong support to the fact that, in an accountability-oriented school system, a significant portion of the professional and support staff manhours assigned to the guidance program may well be assigned to duties other than counseling students.

A major responsibility of the guidance program in such a system is to serve as a facilitator and change agent in relation to the career education program, the total curriculum, and the community. Appropriate guidance staff members will serve as:

- Consultants to teachers (helping teachers understand students better, providing teachers with occupational and labor market information, etc.
- coordinators of group guidance programs
- counselors to parents
- coordinators of community resources
- managers of the school placement program
- influencers of the curriculum
- referral agents to special services
- coordinators of (or consultants to) the school's testing and pupil appraisal program

In the Comprehensive Career Education Model, more and more of what the counselor has traditionally considered his responsibility is being incorporated into the curriculum, including developmental approaches to increased self-understanding, knowledge of the world of work, and the development of decision-making skills. (In this context, the counselor's responsibilities often change from a major emphasis on direct service to students to the role of resource agent to other staff members. (A significant part of this new responsibility may involve assessment of how well program components, and the program as a whole, are meeting desired outcomes.)

Definition and assignment of specific functions within the guidance program are a responsibility of each CCEM school and will normally be influenced by the educational

level served, the nature and needs of the student body, and any specialized objectives of the school in question (e.g., a vocational high school). There will, I am certain, be an increasing emphasis on the use of para-professionals.

The development of a full-functioning guidance program will be simplified and enhanced if the program is built around a conceptual framework which recognizes that the components of a total program fall logically into two groups: the Content (or supportive) components, which are systems oriented and which normally do not involve direct counselor-student contact, and the Delivery System dimensions which involve direct service by guidance operatives (supervisor, counselor, or para-professional) to students, parents, or staff members.

These basic components may be further defined, by type, as follows:

Content or Supportive Components:
- Pupil Data System
- Career Information System
  - Educational
  - Occupational-Job
  - Labor Market
- Resource Coordination System
- Guidance Program Planning and Evaluation

Delivery System Components:
- Student Services
  - Group Guidance
  - Counseling
  - Referral
  - Placement
- Staff Involvement
- Parent Involvement

So looking at the program this way we have a base for checking up on ourselves or a base for accountability.

Special emphasis should probably be placed on the Placement Services Component.

I believe that we all see as the single dominating objective of the Comprehensive Career Education Model the development by each Local Educational Agency of an educational program of a nature and quality that will assure every student placement in an appropriate next step beyond high school, either in employment or in a continuing educational pursuit.

The existence of a good educational program, however,

> does not guarantee the placement of its end products. The CCEM school must be geared up, with a formally organized placement program, to help every student take that next step when he leaves school, whether he be exiting to a job or to further educational pursuits and whether he be exiting cum laude or sana diploma.[2]

Possibly the best parting shot I can take when examining the concept of accountability as it relates to guidance program administration is to remind you that the concept placed emphasis on planning for results. I think this is it. We must plan for results if we are going to come up with results in the end. To provide adequately for ongoing accountability any program must:

- be mission oriented
- be designed to flow from start to finish
- be designed to facilitate program management and monitoring
- produce alternative methods to the extent needed
- provide for evaluation and feedback.

---

[2] The CCEM Guidance and Placement Program, Remarks made by John G. Odgers, Specialist, Guidance and Placement, at orientation meeting of CCEM participants at The Center for Vocational and Technical Education, The Ohio State University, September 22, 1971.

# EVALUATING GUIDANCE--WHY, WHAT, AND HOW

Martin R. Katz

Educational Testing Service
Princeton, New Jersey

My thoughts today are very much of Jim Allen. He devoted a considerable part of his time this past year as a senior advisor to ETS. Like most people in other spectors of American education, we at ETS will miss his courage, his compassion, his dedication to democratic ideals and values.

Last time I saw him we were partners in a tennis match. His vigor and confidence on the court remain vivid in my memory as a reflection of the energy and zeal to which he applied himself to every activity. It is a good memory to hold on to.

# EVALUATING GUIDANCE--WHY, WHAT, AND HOW

Martin R. Katz

My talk today will deal with three major questions about evaluation of school guidance programs: Why should we evaluate them? What, exactly, are we evaluating? And, finally, how can we go about doing evaluations?

The first question, Why evaluate, is the easiest one to answer. One reason is to do our work better. Another reason is to convince others that our work is worth supporting. A third reason I will hold in suspension until after we have talked some more about why, what, and how.

The first reason--self-improvement--recognizes that a counselor is accountable to himself. Evaluation by the counselor in terms of his own standards, expectations, and concepts is a continuous feedback loop of the sort we all use to monitor most of our efforts and try to improve them. The emphasis in this evaluation for improvement is on processes and short-term products. At a very primitive level, the counselor watches what he is doing while he is doing it, makes some observations about immediate effects, and takes corrective action as indicated. There's no sense in waiting for long-term outcomes if you know you have to make a change now. For example, a speaker on a platform--like this--can sense whether anyone is listening to him or not. If not, he has to do something different--right away--talk louder or softer, speed up his delivery or slow it down, say something new or maybe something more familiar.

This is evaluation of micro-actions--before they have aggregated and agglutinated into a macro-program. It deals with the "necessary but not sufficient" conditions for success. If there is anything that can possibly be accomplished by speaking, it can't be accomplished unless someone is listening.

If a counselor announces office hours and sits back to wait for students to come in--and no one comes in--than he knows it's time to try something else. If he puts occupational information into a file, and no one uses it--then he knows it's not doing any good, and a new approach is required.

This mention of "something else" or a "new approach" suggests that evaluation involves a choice between alternatives. It helps to have a big pool of alternatives available. If there truly were only one way to accomplish an objective, evaluation of process would be futile. Occasionally, we keep on doing something--even though it doesn't work--because we can't think of an alternative. Creativity in counselors may often take the form of seeking and finding other ways to do things when our current way doesn't work. Creativity may be fostered and stimulated as counselors make these ongoing informal evaluations more systematic, more structured, more explicit. My colleague, Henry Dyer, calls this kind of simple systematic investigation "shirtsleeves

research." It may consist of no more sophisticated data-collection than counting. For example, how many students used the occupational information file? Just formulating the question may be enough to indicate what kind of data are needed and how they should be interpreted, at least for this most primitive level of process evaluation.

Evaluation of process leads naturally to evaluation of product. If the students are reading the occupational information materials, what good is it doing them? Are they learning something important, and useful for their career decision-making? If they are coming in to talk to the counselor, what difference is it making? What contribution is each procedure or facility making to some outcome, or product? To gain some objective, how much time should a given student spend on each procedure? How much of the talk or of the reading could you delete without affecting outcomes? John Wanamaker, the department store merchant, once said, "I know that half the money I spend on advertising is wasted. The trouble is I don't know which half." Maybe half the time we spend talking to kids is wasted. (Runkel did a study in Illinois high schools that showed no relationship between such process variables as frequency of student-counselor talks and such criteria as students' information about chosen occupation and the appropriateness of curriculum choices to occupational choices.) Can we devise studies that open up the "black box" of the counseling interview and tease out the elements that are effective?--effective, that is, for which students under which circumstances in accomplishing which objectives? We probably can't do this in "shirt sleeves"--we need to put on the research specialist's coat for evaluations of that complexity.

But the first step in such evaluations--the step in which purposes are stated--is one that the counselor can take and should certainly want to take. Others may not agree with his goals--with what he says should be the product of this work. But he has to spell out what he is trying to do if he is going to be accountable to himself for outcomes. I am not saying that he will readily find the opportunity to check out how well he accomplishes his long-range goals, his ultimate product. But at least he has to have the long-range objectives conceptualized in order to define intermediate and short-range objectives that are logically aligned with them. In brief, the improvement of processes implies that purposes and goals are known. Others may not necessarily agree with them--but the counselor shall say what his goals are.

This first step in the counselor's accountability to himself is also the first step in his accountability to others. The more explicit he can make his own objectives for guidance and his standards for judging accomplishment, the more clearly he can perceive the demands, expectations, and standards of others to whom he is accountable--students, their parents, administrators, other school staff, the community. Enlarging in this way his consciousness of agreements and differences between his own concept of his role and the concepts others have of it, he is better

prepared to negotiate with these others--to build on areas of agreement and to try to reconcile differences, or at least increase understanding and tolerance of differences on all sides. By knowing and communicating his objectives,he can influence the nature of the accounting system which others may use in evaluating his work. He can help direct the traffic, not just stand there and maybe get run over.

In the speech he would have delivered this morning, Dr. Allen used a different metaphor to express his high hopes for public accountability. He called public accountability "the most promising cure for many of education's most serious ills." He warned, however, that the public is becoming "sophisticated and able to detect any attempts to substitute more of the same old brew in new bottles." This expression brings to mind an episode described by my wife on her return from the weekly shopping she does every day at the supermarket. In the parking lot, she saw a woman she knew to be pregnant suddenly slump over the steering wheel. Fearing an "emergency," she ran to offer help and found the woman doubled up not in labor but in laughter. It seems she was en route to visit her obstetrician, who had told her to bring in a urine specimen. The only container available at home had been an empty whiskey bottle. While she was in the store, someone had stolen her whiskey bottle. Our moral is that the new bottle labeled accountability will not fool many people for very long, if the contents are the same old bleep--which has so frequently been used in evaluations--counselor-student ratios, or hours of graduate study completed by counselors, or size of the occupational library.

Going from scatology to eschatology, we must expect--as Dr. Allen has warned--that public evaluative judgments will be made of guidance programs. Since the beginnings of NDEA, guidance has enjoyed a favored status. Under NDEA support, guidance programs were established at many schools that had previously had none. But after the mid-60's, NDEA support fell off, and the burden fell heavier on local school districts. In his recent book, Eli Ginzberg recommends cutting off all mandated federal aid to guidance. He urges that the issue of support for guidance programs be decided "not in the halls of Congress but closer to home." In other words, he would put guidance needs in the pit with other educational needs. The magic claimed for accountability is that in Lessinger's words, "resources and efforts are related to results in ways that are useful for policy-making, resource allocation, or compensation." Thus the decision-makers at federal and local levels want to examine cost-effectiveness so that they can make decisions about deployment of resources. The present Commissioner of Education, Dr. Marland, has recently made a commitment to support model career development programs with a strong guidance component--implemented by $9 million allocation for 1972. His directive requires emphasis on "careful measurement of student outcomes in relation to the treatments." It also requires cost information on each component. Finally, it calls for "third party evaluation." So we see that even the supporters of guidance do not exempt guidance programs from

judgments. These judgments, however, are lower case and plural. They should not be mistaken for the Judgment Day, when presumably the purpose of the evaluation will be perfectly clear, the criteria sharply defined, and the measures absolutely reliable and valid. The present-day judgments, in contrast, will be fallible: we see no clear consensus on purposes, there are sharp disagreements on fuzzy criteria, and measures that have been developed so far appear to have validities that are, at best, indeterminate or modest.

This brings us to the question of what we are trying to evaluate. There seems little prospect in the immediate future of convincing the public--or even yourself that any of the following direct questions can be answered definitively: Does guidance work? Does it achieve its goals? How well is the guidance program at your school doing? Are children getting good guidance? What difference is it making in their careers? Are the programs worth what they cost? Is the money they cost being used efficiently? Should the guidance programs continue to do what they are doing?

Tumin has called evaluative questions like these the "fool's questions"--"because they are absolutely right to ask and impossible to answer as put." These are the big questions that research and evaluation studies have never been able to answer. At least not unless one fragments each of these questions into sub-questions, defines each fragment in operational terms, samples from the new sets of questions that are thus generated, and identifies relevant observations or measures with the expectation that enough such observations can be combined to represent a facet of each little question, and that enough answers to little questions eventually allow us to assemble some kind of inference about one of the fragments of a big question--and so on.

Let's take an illustration. We ask a big question, are high school students getting good guidance? Let's define a sub-question: Are they making their career decisions wisely? This sub-question must be sliced up into smaller and smaller questions before we can begin to answer it. Recent studies have attempted to elaborate a construct called "vocational maturity," and ask whether students have gained in vocational maturity. One indicator of vocational maturity might be, are they seeking occupational information? One of many ways in which they might seek occupational information is through reading printed materials in the occupational information library or files. Aha, now we have something we can observe or measure. We can count the uses made of these materials, we can ask students what use they make of them, we can test students on the information contained in them. Does this kind of observation or measure tell us whether they are making career decisions wisely, and whether they are getting good guidance? How many little questions like this must we answer in order to make an inference about the big question, "Are they making career decisions wisely"? or "Are they getting good guidance?"

Am I lacking in the reverence that is usually given by

evaluators to "behavioral objectives"? Do I imply that defining and measuring behavioral objectives is not adequate for evaluation? Just so. Focusing exclusively on behavioral objectives can lure us into rationalizing the inclusion of behaviors just because they are easy to measure. Often the use of such behaviors and their measures in evaluation tends to impoverish rather than to enrich practice. Teaching to the test makes us lose sight of the big question, the fool's question. Guidance is not the only field in which this problem occurs. Even the "hard curriculum" areas face it. For example, an ETS colleague, Sheldon Myers, had criticized current statements of behavioral objectives for mathematics in elementary grades on the basis of their "great specificity. The unfortunate consequence of this atomization is that the interrelatedness of mathematical concepts is lost and the statement is a tedious list of very trivial low-level skills."

Lee Cronbach has pointed out that specific behaviors can and should be used as indicators of constructs but not as the definers of those constructs. It is the constructs, the network of relations or characteristics, that are crucial to evaluation--not a single specific incident of behavior. "The operationists who want to equate each construct with one indicator," he says, " . . . are advocating that we restrict descriptions to statements of tasks performed or behavior exhibited and are rejecting construct interpretations. . . . The writers on curriculum and evaluation who insist that objectives be defined in terms of behavior . . . are denying the appropriateness and usefulness of constructs."

Let's point this problem up by assuming that you are working under a performance contract. You are to be paid according to the "results" you get. Now how are results to be measured? You name one objective of guidance as helping students make career decisions wisely. You invoke the construct of vocational maturity. You assume that information plays a role in this. You may reason, as I wrote some years ago:

> Decision-making . . . may be regarded as a strategy for acquiring and processing information. If a decision is truly to be made, if it is not a foregone conclusion, it must involve some novel elements. The person confronted with the problem of decision-making either does not know what information he needs, does not have what information he wants, or cannot use what information he has. Thus, the pressure for making a decision creates a discrepancy between the individual's present state of knowledge (or wisdom) and the state that is being demanded of him.

The role of guidance should be to reduce the discrepancy between a student's untutored readiness for rational behavior and

some hypothetical ideal state of knowledge and wisdom. So the appropriate criteria for a given program designed to retail information might be: (1) Do students know what information they need? (2) Can they get the information they want? (3) Can they use the information they have?"

But when all this language gets translated into specific measurable behaviors for a performance contract, the contract may call for a questionnaire to be given students on the extent to which they use occupational information materials, or a count of such uses, or a test of knowledge of facts about occupations. Would you as the contractor then attempt to develop in students a general competency in the strategy of information-processing? Or would you--as the Texarkana contractors are alleged to have done--find a more direct route to raising scores on the criterion measure? After all, students can be induced in many ways to take materials out of a library, or to respond in a certain way on a questionnaire, or even to memorize some facts. They would not need a "guidance program" for this--just, if we wanted to be crass about it, a little coaching. One can raise scores on such criterion measures without affecting the outcome that is of real concern. Such an increase in scores would be no more valuable than, in Thorndike's phrase, boiling the thermometer to heat the house.

The ripple effect of studies that use such measures of specific behaviors is another problem. By the time the study report gets cited in the literature, the specific behaviors and measures that underlie the findings are often forgotten. A verbal summary of the conclusions is quoted and requoted: "This treatment significantly increased information-seeking behavior of students and thereby contributed to an improvement of wisdom in decision-making and again in vocational maturity." The indicator has now become a definer. The network of lines from specific measures to constructs has been short-circuited.

So the question what to measure leaves us in a dilemma. On the one hand we don't want to swamp our evaluative enterprise with meaningless rhetoric about goals that gives us no clue to measurement of progress. On the other hand, we don't want to limit our observations to trivial and low-level behaviors that are directly coachable under such conditions as performance contracting.

So where, we must ask, is the middle ground between what Tumin calls "trivial precision and apparently rich ambiguity?" Let's see whether we can find it in any of the criteria that have been kicking around for some years.

First, we must face the problem of long-range vs. short-range criteria. Unfortunately, this has been a very slippery problem. Like a fussy fisherman who cannot eat what he can catch and cannot catch what he could eat, the would-be evaluator has found angling for data on long-range outcomes overtaxes his patience and resources, while the short-term data that are easily netted often lack nourishment or flavor and may well be thrown

back. The ultimate criteria for judging effectiveness of a full-scale vocational guidance program have been elusive. What many want to know is: Does guidance make a difference in people's careers? What kind of occupational success, adjustment, and satisfaction do they achieve? What contributions do they make to society? To fish for answers to such questions takes time, money, and control of many variables.

Precious few have even tried to conduct longitudinal evaluation studies ranging over a period of years. Rothney's follow-up of experimental and control groups beyond high school is a notable exception. He used many criteria, such as amount of post-secondary education, achievement in college, promotions in jobs, satisfaction with current status and with intervening decisions and actions. (In general, differences between the experimental and control groups were small and not significant. But even if there had been significant differences, would the time-lag and changing conditions permit assurance that the same treatment would have equally favorable outcome today?) At any rate, most evaluators of guidance, like those who evaluate other areas of the school curriculum, settle for the kind of criteria they can net more readily. A comprehensive search of their creels over the last 35 years discloses, most commonly, such criteria as student satisfaction with counseling; persistence in school; comparisons of students' self-ratings with test scores; judges' ratings of "realism" or "appropriateness" of "preferred occupations" named by students; the proportion of a class expressing an occupational goal; the constancy of expressed occupational choice over a period of time (say, from ninth to twelfth grade); the relationship between proportion of a high school class expressing preference for each occupation and the latest census count showing proportion of working force in each occupation in the community; expressions of counselee satisfaction; improvement in counselees' school marks; etc. (Incidentally, guidance has rarely made a significant difference in these variables. There is no clear reason why it should.)

Notwithstanding consistent negative results, these criteria may have had some utility for the objectives of guidance that were widely accepted up to about 1950. The increasing acceptance of recent development in guidance theory, however, has made the digestibility of such criteria increasingly dubious. Today, such data seem hardly worth pulling from the stream; the would-be evaluator must find other fish to fry. It is evident that the construct represented by all these long-range and short-range criterion variables was whether students had learned to make wise decisions. That is, were the outcomes better for the experimental group than for the control group?

But to evaluate the long-term outcomes of decisions is not only difficult: It is presumptuous. Tennyson wrote, "no man can be more wise than destiny." I would feel more comfortable if we changed the criterion from "Making Wise Decisions" to "Making Decisions Wisely." This shifts the emphasis from content to process. "Wise decisions" implies an understanding of outcomes and

a mastery over events to which we cannot aspire. "Making decisions wisely," on the other hand, implies an understanding of self and a mastery over processes which may be more attainable. It is in this sense of wisdom that Tennyson is contradicted by the old Latin motto, Fato prudentia major (Wisdom is stronger than fate).

Suppose you were counseling students in the late 50's or early 60's, and heeded the goal supported by Congress, under NDEA, to identify able students and encourage them to continue with their education and prepare for certain high-level occupations. Of course, NDEA owed its existence partly to the shock of sputnik--so you might feel particularly effective, if with your guidance, one of your brightest and ablest students decided to become an aerospace engineer. How gratifying for you to have done your duty by Congress and your profession! But now your former student is unemployed. Was his decision a wise one? Was your guidance good?

The problem in identifying wise decisions, however, is not just the time-lag between the choice-point and the judgment day--the day when all the evidence on consequences of the choice is in. Nor is it just a matter of insufficient predictive validity. Predictive data are really historical data, and our predictions are manifestations of what we have learned from history. Thus, if our predictors had perfect validity, we could extend the aphorism "Those who do not learn from history are condemned to repeat it," by adding "and those who do learn from history are also condemned to repeat it." But in fact we don't repeat history, even when events materialize as we have predicted. For there is always a surplus of events--there are more events than predictions. The outcomes of decisions exceed the purposes of decision-makers. Any decision that is not trivial has ramifications without end. Each outcome then may generate new purposes and predictions may be buried under this landslide of outcomes and decisions and outcomes.

Consider, as a somewhat painful example, the decision of the U.S. Government to intervene in Vietnam. One could argue, and indeed the government has argued, that this was a wise decision in that the purposes of this decision were (and are being) fulfilled as predicted. But surely the government does not maintain that all the outcomes of that decision were predicted, and it has built no granaries for storing the surplus events until such time as we need them--or at least are better able to cope with them. As the Pentagon papers have made clear, the fault in the decision to intervene in Vietnam was in the process, not just in the outcome. Suppose the outcome had been somewhat different: suppose we had had a great military success there--had "brought the coonskin home and nailed it to the wall." Would that military success have wiped the slate clean of the flaws in decision-making? Would it have justified our decision? Perhaps it would have prevented the moral questions from being raised--as when we intervened in the Dominican Republic--although it is unlikely that we could have "won" in Vietnam that fast, or with less

publicity and condemnation than the Russian interventions in Hungary and Czechoslovakia. At least a few voices--voices like Jim Allen's--would have cried out in the wilderness about the moral issues. But a victorious outcome would have prevented widespread popular concern. My Lai and tiger cages and one-man election races would never have plagued us, and the whole incident would have soon blown over in the media and the public consciousness. Would that military success have made the decision a wise one? Would the decision have been made any more wisely?

For the sake of argument, let us suppose that we have predicted and can evaluate the ramified outcomes of this decision to intervene as in some sense superior to those which would have been produced by any alternative decision. Even then, what would the substantive payoff of this decision reinforce? The content of this decision itself? But this same decision is not likely to come up again. We only pass this way once. Then we would be hard put to claim an increment in wisdom from the content of this decision. The content of a single wise decision is not likely to be transferable to the next decision, and the next.

In fact, what one learns from the multitude of real-life outcomes may or may not be relevant to wisdom. Like Mark Twain's cat, who learned from sitting on a hot stove never to sit on any stove again, we may learn from these outcomes more "wisdom" than is in them. For example, the current overflow of outcomes from the Vietnam decision might teach us to revert to isolationism (in contradiction to the "lessons" from previous decisions and outcomes). The little boy who is spanked for turning the faucets on full blast and flooding the bathroom may learn not to wash his hands and face.

It is these tendencies to "generalize" that lead the behaviorists to concern themselves with what Skinner calls "contingencies" in their schedules of reinforcement. Or as O. H. Mowrer once put it, in a classroom discussion of one of his learning experiments, "You've got to be smarter than the rat." Well said, since such an approach to defining wisdom in terms of outcomes requires that wisdom reside in the experimenter--or counselor, not in the subject--or student. But this is where the presumption comes in: do we as counselors know which decisions are wise?

Here one may object, are there not "universally desired" outcomes that represent a cultural consensus or folk wisdom for which the counselor may serve as spokesman? Let us grant this, while noting that we may retain some squeamishness about our ability to identify such universals even in retrospect, let alone in advance. Presumably, we can teach students to make these decisions that lead--with a high degree of probability and with low risk--to universally desired outcomes.

But when we have identified such universals and induced students to learn them, we are not really concerned with decision-making--or with guidance. Then we are concerned with indoctrination. A large part of an individual's schooling consists of

such indoctrination. The distinctive concern of guidance, however, is not with the universals, but with the "alternatives"--toward which the culture tends to be more permissive.

However, I must express some dissatisfaction with the term "alternatives." The individual is not always constrained to choose from clearly shaped alternatives that are already "there" like the options in a multiple-choice test. He often has some opportunity to construct, or create, his own options--in the sense that the poet creates his verses, perhaps creates alternative verses, before choosing the ones he wants. He is not merely choosing alternatives from his total vocabulary, any more than the painter is merely choosing colors and lines from an existing pool of options. He does not find his new and unique combinations, variations, and transformations by considering all possible permutations. Fifty chimpanzees typing for fifty years might compose the complete works of Shakespeare, but they wouldn't know how to write a new work of similar quality. In terms of content and outcomes, they might have made "wise" decisions, and yet they would be none the wiser. As critics, we can evaluate the poet's decisions, recognize them as creative, or wise, and teach someone to memorize them. We can even derive and apply rules for transfer of content. For example, we can analyze a line like "Now is the winter of our discontent" and recognize an association between emotion or state of mind and a season of the year, in which season is used to represent feeling. No doubt, a computer could be programmed to ring the changes on this kind of association, with such results as "Now is the summer of my happiness," Now is the spring of my joy," Now is the autumn of my melancholy," etc. ad nauseam. But could it ever make the long leap from this last to reach "My way of life is fallen into the sere, the yellow leaf . . ."? This illustrates, I think, the gap between recognition of a creative, or wise, decision and the ability to make one. How often the best and wisest decision is not to choose between historically "given" alternatives, but to construct a new option. Like able students who squirm at being forced to choose the best of five bad options on a multiple-choice test question, our wisest decision-makers can sometimes think of a better response than any given.

I hope that all this suggests an "alternative" to defining wisdom in terms of outcomes. How a choice comes out, and even how one chooses between alternatives, may be less important than how one constructs alternatives. In this view, wisdom derives not from the outcome of a decision but from the process of decision-making. And our greatest folk-wisdom, our most compelling "universal," may apply most directly to the process of constructing and choosing alternatives.

For may we not regard democracy itself as an evolving process of decision-making? It is its processes, not the content of any one policy decision, that make it distinctive.

We recognize, as a crucial characteristic for the processes by which we ideally make national policy decisions, that our

society is pluralistic. On every issue competing interests and pressure groups are heard. Sometimes they differ on predictions of outcomes--for example, the effects of a tax increase on the economy. More often, and more significantly, they have different definitions of desirability, different objectives, even when they agree on predictions of outcomes. How do these differences get resolved "wisely"? The necessary condition, we believe, is freedom--the open marketplace of ideas, in which every voice can be heard and judged. Out of this confrontation of competing values, the legislative or executive can find--or claim to find--a consensus for decision, to be translated into a mandate for action. But it does not stop there. The process is ongoing, permitting revision of content in accordance not just with outcomes, but also with changes in values and objectives. This provision for change, this ability to accommodate to new situations and circumstances, has perhaps insured the survival of democracy, up till now, through many vicissitudes. (Our ability to reverse our decision on Vietnam is a sign of strength, not of weakness.)

Need I belabor the analogy with individual decision-making? The individual, too, recognizes that he must choose between competing values. How then does he make order out of the rabble of impulses that beset him? They should be neither suppressed nor blindly obeyed, but brought under the rule of reason, each given "equal time" and attention. The individual, like the nation, must hold himself open and receptive to different values, allowing each to speak to him as loudly as the others. This process involves active and systematic examination and exploration of competing values.

One way in which he can examine values is to study their sources. Here we see a nice articulation of education and guidance. If a major purpose of education is to transmit the culture, an important purpose of guidance is to help the individual come to terms with the culture--that is, the choices he makes will indicate how he sees himself in the culture. But first he must see the culture in himself. So his first question must be, where have my values come from? Then he will be better prepared to ask, where are they taking me?

When the student has taken full cognizance of the range of values in the culture, and has formulated his own value system quite explicitly, he will be ready to lay his values on the line in making a decision. The specifics of a strategy for accomplishing this I have described elsewhere and will not have time to go into now. But I want to emphasize that with the individual, as with the nation, decision-making should be an ongoing process, subject to continual revision. Otherwise, he may run afoul of the warning that "the only thing worse than not getting what you want is getting it."

In shunning a definition of wise decisions in terms of content, or predicted outcome, I have assumed that experience does not teach us what will be best for the individual (or society)

except freedom to work things out. Thus, I have defined the best choice as the choice that is most nearly free. But I do not define freedom as complete laisser-faire. Rather, it is the freedom (expressed by Shaw in the preface to Man and Superman and quoted by Freud in contrasting his "reality principle" with his "pleasure principle") "to be able to choose the line of greatest advantage instead of yielding in the path of least resistance." So without directing the content of an individual's choice, we do think we can help him in the process of choosing. This emphasis on process does not pretend to insure the "right choice--except insofar as the right choice is defined as an informed and rational choice. Our bias--our conviction--is that in education enlightened processes are intrinsically important. Therefore, we bend our efforts to increase the student's understanding of the factors involved in choice (imperfect though our own understanding may be) so that he can take responsibility for his own decision-making, examine himself and explore his options in a systematic and comprehensive way, take purposeful action in testing hypotheses about himself in various situations, and exercise flexibility in devising alternate plans.

In short, we don't want to play the decision-making game for him. We want to help him master the strategies for rational behavior in the face of uncertainty (which may be the nearest he can get to wisdom) so that he can play the game effectively himself.

Horace, in one of his satires, asked "Who then is free?" and answered "The wise man who can govern himself."

So now at last we move on to the question of how evaluations can be made. In an interesting paper just published, Hartnett has pointed out some of the weaknesses of the classic model of evaluation, which involves such elements as (1) behaviorally defined objectives, (2) the random assignment of subjects to treatments, (3) clearly differentiated treatments, and (4) criterion measures chosen or developed on the basis of the behavioral objectives. He suggests that dissatisfactions with this model are leading to two important changes: a concern for the consequences, not just the objectives, of a treatment, and a style of inquiry which is exploratory in nature rather than attempting to apply in life situations the kinds of controls and manipulations that are feasible only in the scientific laboratory.

Pace has typified the new models in this way: "The spirit of the evaluator should be adventurous. If only that which could be controlled or focused were evaluated, then a great many important educational and social developments would never be evaluated . . . that would be a pity."

In guidance, this exploratory set must be emphasized. We have no neat evaluation packages all wrapped up and ready to use. For example, a number of people have developed what purport to be measures of "Vocational Maturity." Can any of these measures be recommended for use?

One of the best known measures is John Crites' VDI, an inventory keyed to the responses of 12th-graders. Extensive research has been done on this instrument--for example, on elimination of variance attributable to acquiescent response set. Yet Super has criticized the instrument on just these grounds: Vocational Maturity, as defined by VDI, means saying no. (There we see it again, the instrument taken as the definer rather than the indicator of a construct.) Another criticism involves the use of 12th-graders' responses as the keyed responses: a group of 10 counselor educators and vocational psychologists disagreed with the keys for a number of items.

Back in the 1950's, I developed an objective test that I am not particularly proud of. It attempted to find out whether students had mastered certain concepts involved in self-appraisal, getting and using information, and decision-making. At the same time, and in connection with the same project, we commissioned Warren Gribbons to develop an interview schedule, known as Readiness for Vocational Planning, to see whether students were actually applying those concepts to their own educational and occupational decisions. We were evaluating a work test for group guidance, and found highly significant differences between experimental and control groups--for example, experimental students scored very significantly higher on the test and also showed very significantly greater awareness of their own values, better ability to define their values and to describe the role their values play in their decision-making, and so on. A group of professionals in guidance, listening to tapes of the interviews without knowledge of the scales or scores, ranked the students in the same order on "vocational maturity" as the total scores did. Gribbons & Lohnes have now converted the interview schedule into a questionnaire form, RCP.

Super and his colleagues have recently developed a Career Questionnaire that also purports to measure vocational maturity. It includes scales called Concern with Choice, Acceptance of Responsibility, Occupational Information, Work Experiences, Crystallization of Interests, and so on--rubrics derived from the Career Pattern Study.

Westbrook has been developing a series of Vocational Maturity Tests, including some of the items from my old test. The items tap various kinds of information, Course and Curriculum Selection, Planning, Goal Selection, etc.

These are the major standarized efforts I know of to get at the construct, vocational maturity, and they are all well conceived; they are good tries. I am not damning them with faint praise. I just want to forewarn you that you may be disappointed when you see the actual instruments and study them item by item. You will agree, I am sure, that even though they may be indicators of vocational maturity, they are not definers of it.

The questions getting at facts about specific occupations hardly seem appropriate for students who may have had no interest

whatsoever in those occupations then, too, a number of the items depend on occupational preferences expressed by the students--for example, Super is concerned with Wisdom of the Vocational Preference" and with "Consistency of Preference."

The title of an occupation, however, is probably a poor indicator of what choosing an occupation means to an individual. More relevant questions might be, in his view, how important an element of his life is represented by occupation? What kinds and amounts of satisfaction does he hope to derive from it? What differentiations does he discern between occupations in capability of providing such satisfactions? How much control over his choice and responsibility for his choice does he appear to exercise? What role do predictive data play in his choosing?--does he consider them? Is he dominated by them? What risks is he willing to take to achieve the occupational satisfactions he says he wants? What decision rules does he employ? What resources does he use? What reality tests of his perceptions and predictions has he made, or does he plan to make? How has he coped--how will he cope--with obstacles and difficulties? Has he formulated viable alternative plans? How explicit and consistent is his reasoning about these questions?

Once we have probed beneath the surface of choice to get at such underlying perceptions, attitudes, and rationales, we may find ourselves with much richer criteria of growth and vocational development. Dr. Bingham's efforts to get at the dimensions along which individuals construe occupations--using an adaptation of Kelly's Role Concept Repertory Test--is a step in this direction. Some of my associates and I have developed and used in an exploratory way, interview schedules to get at students' occupational constructs. We had them look at occupations and sort them in the way that Kelly's Role Concept Repertory Test would. We asked them to do some analysis of their own values. We found that some of the more productive questions were things like this: "Now sit back and turn your imagination loose. Try to describe, as fully as you can, what you would regard as an ideal of 'dream' occupations. It can be a real occupation, or one you invent." And then as the student began to fill out the description of this occupation we asked questions which pushed him toward filling it out more and more. Then after he had done all this, we said, "In view of what you said about an ideal occupation, why didn't you decide to become a _____?" Here we had to be fast on our feet and think of an occupation that seemed to fit his ideal, instead of whatever occupation he had named as his preferred choice. This is very interesting because it puts him in the position of trying to work his way through his reasons for choice. Here he's given a choice and described something which may fit a little bit better some other choice. As he works his way out of this, as he tries to explain and rationalize what he has done, he's really challenging himself to pin down his values, to pin down more explicitly what it is he wants. And then we asked, "Now reverse your field and think of the worst occupation you can. If the other was a 'dream' this would be a 'nightmare':

Describe it." Again, we looked to see what values were involved. And again we saw whether these were contrasted with or agreed in some respects with the occupation of his expressed preference. Of course the interview itself had its effects. One probably cannot measure the status of an individual's decision-making without influencing it. For instance, at the end of interviews with junior college students we got comments like this: the interview "extended my ideas about what to look for in an occupation," "made me think about why I was making my choice," and so on. For example, it seemed to have a particularly strong impact on one student who had appeared especially firm and specific in his plan to become a chemical engineer. Working as a draftsman after his graduation from high school (where he said he had been "pushed into" a vocational curriculum by his guidance counselor), he had had a particularly good opportunity to observe chemical engineers at work and had an unusually thorough knowledge of their work activities. His perceptions (in the comparisons of occupations) seemed fixed almost exclusively on one construct: whether an occupation offered an outlet for scientific interest and inventiveness, or not. The sole deviation involved a discrimination between occupations in terms of altruism--opportunity to help others. The systematic exploration and examination that accompanied his scaling of values brought out more explicit recognition of Altruism as a value of some importance to him. With this discovery, other values of which he had not been fully aware also came into focus as quite important to him: notably Variety and Autonomy. At the end he said that the interview had "brought to the surface values I've held but never recognized. That shakes me. . . . If I had two lives to lead, for one of them I'd go into the Peace Corps as soon as I finished college. Maybe then I'd try to become a high school teacher or counselor, or a community worker. But I came up the hard way. There are things I see now I want to do, but I can't do them until I get firm ground under me. I'm still determined to become a chemical engineer. Not like a machine, though, but like a person."

If you can't measure a condition without changing it, does that mean you should not try to measure it? No, not even if it is a differential influence, affecting different students in different ways. After all, people encounter many common experiences that have differential effects, and this attempt at measurement is only one of such an unknown number. The differential effect may indeed be part of the substance of what we are trying to investigate. Messick has pointed out that traditional questions in education and psychology have frequently spawned answers that are either downright wrong, in that they summarize findings "on the average" in situations where a hypothetical "average person" simply doesn't exist, or else are seriously lacking in generality, in that they fail to take account of the multiplicity of human differences and their interactions with environmental circumstances.

An example is the "horse race" question typical of much

educational research of past decades: Is treatment A better than treatment B? Such questions are usually resolved by comparing average gains in achievement for students receiving treatment A with average gains for students receiving treatment B. But suppose treatment A is better for certain kinds of students and treatment B better for other kinds of students? A completely different evaluation of the treatments might result if some other, more complicated questions had been asked, such as "Do these treatments interact with differences in personality and cognitive characteristics of students--or with differences in their educational history, or family background, or community, or culture--to produce differential effects upon achievement?"

Hard upon this warning of the complexity of evaluation in guidance, let me quote again from Henry Dyer:

> "The term educational accountability, as used most recently by certain economists, systems analysts, and the like, has frequently been based on a conceptualization that tends, by analogy, to equate the educational process with the type of engineering process that applied to industrial production. . . . It must be constantly kept in mind that the educational process is not on all fours with an industrial process; it is a social process in which human beings are continually interacting with other human beings in ways that are imperfectly measurable or predictable. Education does not deal with inert raw materials, but with living minds that are instinctively concerned first with preserving their own integrity and second with reaching a meaningful accommodation with the world around them. The output of the educational process is never a "finished product" whose characteristics can be rigorously specified in advance; it is an individual who is sufficiently aware of his own incompleteness to make him want to keep on growing and learning and trying to solve the riddle of his own existence in a world that neither he nor anyone else can fully understand or predict."

Despite these problems, evaluate we must. And so I come back, in conclusion, to my third reason for why we evaluate.

My third reason for evaluation, despite all its snarls and pitfalls, is simply this. If we believe in trying to help students make career decisions wisely--that is, make rational and informed decisions--then we must also, in all honesty, believe that guidance practitioners should make their professional decisions wisely. We have to provide students with a model for decision-making behavior--and that is just what an evaluation process is. It is a commitment to use of information and reason, to rational behavior under conditions of uncertainty. So--like the students-- we must take responsibility for evaluation. We must make our professional values explicit, examine

and explore them. We must formulate hypotheses about the effects of our activities, and try to get feedback. We must revise our hypotheses, plans, and activities in the light of new information.

When we evaluate, we commit ourselves to a continuous process of decision-making. It is a commitment we should welcome. The methods and the product may leave much to be desired. But let us realize that commitment to the process itself may be a powerful indicator of how good a school guidance program is.